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Our research groups:

- Ignored Modernity
- Applied research to development
**Introduction**


Our first research into the massive residential architecture

---

**Estudio, catalogación y definición de estrategias de recuperación del patrimonio moderno de Luanda.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edificio:</th>
<th>Ministerio de Obras Públicas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arquitecto:</td>
<td>Vasco VIERA DA COSTA (1911-1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Código de referencia:</td>
<td>VC2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Año de construcción: | 1968 |
| Tipología: | Equipamiento. Servicios. |
| Referencia en el plano de trabajo: | 2 |
| Dirección: | Largo da Mutamba. |
| Uso: | Sede del Ministerio de Obras Públicas de la República. |

**Planta de localización:**

**Planta de implantación:**

**Planimetría:**

**Fotografías:**

**Información gráfica.**

**Datos generales del edificio.**

**Datos relativos a su estado de conservación.**

| Estado de conservación: | Bueno. |
| Mantiene su función original: | Sí. |
| Viabilidad de recuperación: | — |

**Información en posesión:**

Planimetría escaneada. Fotografías propias (Agosto 2008) y extraídas de bibliografía e Internet. Dibujos y textos.

**Bibliografía:**

Introduction

2012-15: IRIS / UAH Agreement

Analysis of social communities built to rehousing inhabitants of gypsy slump (1985-1995).
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2015-19: Madrid City Council / UAH Agreement

Study, with postgraduate students, of the relocation policies of Informal settlements of recent years, with special attention of southern Madrid situation.
I. Define and evaluate the public rehousing politics in Madrid

II. Find patterns to address, with guarantees of success, the current relocations processes; as Cañada Real, where we participate.

Common goals
We base the evaluation of these public mass housing policies in three general criterial.
1. Systemic city conception

“I understand the city as a system of physical, social and political situations that are interrelated, so that a change in one of them affects the others.”

Víctor Saúl Pelli
Architect
Buenos Aires, 1931
Evaluation criteria

2. Rights Framework

Human Rights

Art. 25: Everyone has the right to an adequate standard of living that ensures [...] housing [...]. UN, 1948

City Rigth World Charter

Collective right [...] to a sustainable city without discrimination of sex, age, race, health, income [...] as well as to preserve its identity and cultural memory.

World Social Forum, Brazil. 2001

ODS & New Urban Agenda

Urban development must become an engine of an economic, social, human development, that safeguards the environment and generates welfare, justice and equity.

Habitat III. Quito, 2016
3. Action opportunity

What problem solve housing policies?

Today, in the opulent Europe, we forget where we come from. And, above all, we forget the current homelessness.
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Summary of the public policies of slump rehousing and social housing in Madrid
CIVITAS: With the end of the Civil War 1936-39 began a strong migration.
Historical review / I. 1939-1957: City of Welcome

CIVITAS: Families build their houses with precarious materials in suburban areas
Historical review / I. 1939-1957: City of Welcome

URBS

1940: 1,088,647 inhabitants
1950: 1,685,425 inhabitants
Historical review / I. 1939-1957: City of Welcome

POLIS: Reconstruction of the country after Civil War

Urgent urbanization

Police control to prevent new slumps

Official promotion of mass economic housing.

5 years plan to create 30,000 homes.

1947. Poblado chabolista Jaime I El Conquistador

1957 Barrio de realojio San Fermín (Madrid)
Historical review / I. 1939-1957: City of Welcome

URBS: Guided neighborhoods

Private construction companies with self-construction contribution
Historical review / I. 1939-1957: City of Welcome

Rather than solving the problem of slums, the plans create social housing, for the working class.

Slums continue

1947. Poblado La Ventilla. Madrid
Historical review / II. 1957-1978: Actions concentrated to major scale problems

**CIVITAS** Population keeps on growing on Madrid periphery

**POLIS:** 1957 Creation of the Housing Ministry. Housing policies for different social groups.

**URBS:** The rehousing politics centers on creation of quarters and Local Units of Absorption. Design of young architects opposite to the pro-Franco esthetics.

Fernando Higuera. Poblado para UVA de Hortaleza, Madrid, 1963
This neighborhoods will significantly improve the living conditions and gradually consolidate.

However, its location will generate a belt of rehousing people, concentrated in the south of the city.

1.1975 Franco dies
1.1978 First elections
2.1982 Socialist government

- Housing policy goes from national to regional government

1978 Lucha vecinal por la necesidad de viviendas.
CIVITAS: The profile of families at risk of social exclusion has changed.

The social elevator has worked for the population except for the ROM ethnic group.
Created to rehouse 62 irregular settlements

Actions:
30 neighborhoods
39,000 homes
150,000 beneficiaries

1986. Identification plate for homes with families likely to be rehoused. Regional Census. Madrid.

**URBS: three typologies**
- Blocks high-rise housing
- Special Typology Neighborhoods
- Temporary camps

1989. Bloque el Ruedo Madrid
1992 BTE La Rosilla
1990 El Cañaveral
POLICY FAILURE

The mass housing blocks have become ghettos.

The neighborhoods, designed to be permanent, all were demolished after 5 years.

The camps, planned for 5 years, lasted 20 years.

Social exclusion and stigmas remain.

Fuente: (Bustamante, 1995)
Citizens get social housing policies to start considering integration. It is understood that housing itself helps but it is not enough.

New policy: Re-housing in height in second-hand housing in a dispersed way throughout the region of Madrid.

Free market housing.
RELATIVE SUCCESS AND SMALL SCALE

Requires cross-cutting work (technical, social and political)

Population uprooting of the place of origin

Loss of the network of mutual support

98% successful social inclusion
The Big Enigma: The City Council of Madrid acquires for the first time competences in housing and it is not known how it will coordinate with the Regional Government.

Excluded population: Family unit enhancement system scattered throughout the Community of Madrid.
- Families can NOT choose where or how to live.
- Deficit of social monitoring of rehoused families.

Bloque de vivienda social. PAU Vallecas. Madrid 2015
Fuente: Comunidad de Madrid
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Need for holistic research to understand the processes of social inclusion

ONLY housing is not the solution. The Right to Housing and the City are not recognized (neither are studied in the Schools of Architecture)

Social exclusion because of habitat is a dynamic process that is inherited from parents to children. The acquisition of a home can break this vicious circle, but typological adequacy, an adequate and multisocial environment and policies are necessary that are positively discriminatory.

The 2030 Agenda is seductive horizon, but the fear to the other and the poor continues (see Aporophobia, Adela Cortina, 2018)
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